

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Firstly, it is respectfully requested that the docket number in the patent office records for this case be changed to 1217.P008.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant appreciates the notice by the Examiner. Applicant will submit a revised Information Disclosure Statement at a later date before the notice of patent issue fee payable.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the abstract of the disclosure for the use of "I claim" because there is more than one inventor. The Examiner has requested "I claim" on page 13, line 12 to be changed to "We claim". Applicant has thus changed the "I claim" on page 13, line 12 to "We claim" as requested by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to Claims 1 – 16 and 25 – 39 because of informalities. Applicant has thus made the following corrections.

Claim 1, line 18: "the plurality of transformed amplitude values" has been changed to "the plurality of transformed amplitude values of the corresponding transformed MCM signal".

Claim 5 & 10, line 2: "comprise" has been changed to "comprises".

Claim 25, line 4: “transformed amplitude values” has been changed to “a plurality of transformed amplitude values”.

Claim 34, line 2: “comprising” has been changed to “comprising steps of”; and lines 14 – 15: “the communication system” has been changed to “the MCM communication system”.

Claim 37 has been canceled.

In view of the above corrections, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

The Examiner rejects Claims 16 and 33 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. More specifically, the Examiner alleges that in Claim 16, lines 1 – 2, “the inverse probability distribution transformer” lacks antecedent basis. Applicant has thus amended Claim 1, line 22 “an inverse probability distribution transform” to “an inverse probability distribution transformer”. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejects Claim 33, line 3: “the plurality of linear transformers” for lacking antecedent basis. Applicant has thus amended the dependency of Claim 33 to depend from Claim 26. The Examiner rejects Claim 33, line 5: “the plurality of amplitude values” for lacking antecedent basis. Applicant has thus amended Claim 33, line 5 “the plurality of amplitude values” to “the plurality of inverted amplitude values”. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The Examiner rejects Claims 37 – 39 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by prior art Hardiman et al. (US 5,937,377; hereinafter “Hardiman”). Applicant has thus canceled Claims 37 – 39.

Applicant also notes that Claims 18, 26-33 have been amended to provide the proper antecedence with base claims 17 and 25.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By Lawrence N. Ginsberg
Lawrence N. Ginsberg, Attorney
Reg. No. 30,943
21 San Antonio
Newport Beach, CA 92660-9112
Tel.: 949-640-6261

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on 2/19/05

Lawrence N. Ginsberg
Lawrence N. Ginsberg, Reg. No. 30,943

2/19/05
Date